

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 639

OD 020 230

AUTHOR Iadicola, Peter; Moore, Helen
 TITLE The Desegregated School and Status Relations among Anglo and Minority Students: The Dilemma of School Desegregation.
 SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md.
 PUB DATE Jul 79
 GRANT PHS-MH-26607-03
 NOTE 41p.: Not available in paper copy due to light print
 EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
 DESCRIPTORS *Acculturation; Black Students; Caucasian Students; Elementary Secondary Education: Grade 6; *Integration Effects; *Race Relations; *School Integration; *Self Concept; Sex Differences; *Social Status; Socioeconomic Status; Spanish Speaking

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the possible incongruence between the two policy goals of desegregation: assimilation and improvement of intergroup relations through the reduction of prejudice by means of equal status contacts between students. The congruence between the two goals was tested by determining the effects of a school environment conducive to assimilation upon status relations between sixth grade Anglo, black, and Hispanic students. It was found that as both the percentage of Anglo students and socioeconomic status of the school increases, so does the level of status inequality between Anglo and minority students. Black males and Hispanic females were found to experience the highest level of status inequality in their relations with Anglo students. Thus, it was shown that by placing minority students in an environment conducive to assimilation, a process develops by which there is replication and reinforcement of the status inequalities found in the dominant society. (Author/PLV)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

JAN 21 1980

ED183639

The Desegregated School and Status Relations among Anglo and
Minority Students: The Dilemma of School Desegregation

by

Peter Iadicola
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
Fort Wayne, Indiana

and

Helen Moore
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Peter Iadicola

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

July, 1979

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Research findings reported in this paper were supported by
Public Health Service Research Grant No. MH 26507-03 from
the National Institute of Mental Health, Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions and conclusions
stated in this paper are not to be construed as officially
representing the policy of the granting agency.

UDO 20230

Abstract

This paper discusses the possible incongruence between the two policy goals of desegregation; assimilation and improvement of intergroup relations through the reduction of prejudice by means of equal status contacts between students. The congruence between the two policy goals is tested by determining the effect of a school environment which is conducive to the accomplishment of the first goal, assimilation, that is, an environment which has a high percentage of Anglo students and high socioeconomic status, upon status relations between Anglo and black students and Anglo and Hispanic students. Generally, it is found that as both the percentage of Anglo students and socioeconomic status of the school increases, so does the level of status inequality between Anglo and black and Anglo and Hispanic students. A sex difference is found to be present in the hypothesized relationships. Black males and Hispanic females experience the highest levels of status inequality in their relations with Anglo students. The analysis was then done separately for males and females of each ethnic group to test for an interaction effect by sex. It is found that the hypotheses were supported only for black males and Hispanic females. There is no theoretical explanation offered to account for the absence of the relationship for the black female and Hispanic male subsamples. Mercer, Iadicola, and Moore's (1979) model of status ranking and equilization processes is introduced as a possible solution to the dilemma of the incongruent relationship between the two policy goals.

THE DESEGREGATED SCHOOL AND STATUS RELATIONS AMONG ANGLO AND
MINORITY STUDENTS: THE DILEMMA OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

This paper examines the effect of mixing students of different ethnic/ racial and social class backgrounds on status relations among Anglo and minority students. The goal of this paper is to integrate two streams of research on desegregation which emanate from the two goals of the social policy as noted in the social science literature. Taking the two goals of the policy as a whole and examining their interrelationships, may shed a new light upon the research in this area.

Desegregation: The Two Policy Goals

Desegregation as a social policy appears to have two objectives. First, it is a movement to assimilate culturally divergent populations which have been segregated from the dominant society. This assimilationist position defines equal opportunity as affording culturally "deprived" students the means to become assimilated and thus, have an equal opportunity to achieve in school and the larger society (Iadicola, 1977, 1978). The goals of the policy are often explicitly noted in the writings of social scientist, and newspaper and magazine columnists.

In 1961, former Harvard University president James Conant recommended improved schooling for the black child to overcome the "adverse" influence of the home and the street. Busing black students to schools outside the slums to bring them in contact with white classmates was the method recommended to prepare them for entrance into middle class society and to motivate them to discard their black and lower class culture (Carlson, 1975:136). Stuart

Alsop (1968:92), a well known and respected columnist, succinctly expresses the goal of assimilation.

An enormous educational effort, starting as early as the second year of life, will have to be made if the children of the Negro immigrant, like the children of other immigrants before them, are to become Americans first and Afro-Americans only second.

Iannacone (1977) notes that by the courts decision in the Brown vs. Board of Education case, that separate is not equal, they took a position consistent with the unitary community view of the progressive period, an assimilationist position. Iannacone concludes that the court's ruling carried the doctrine of progressivism to its inevitable conclusion.

Gerard and Miller (1975:15-20) note eleven theoretical assumptions of the policy of desegregation:

1. The achievement gap is not due to differences in native ability between black and whites.
2. The educational gap is due to a difference in orientation toward educational attainment within the black and the white communities. . . . White values stress academic achievement more than do black values.
3. Achievement orientation deficits are reversable and are easier to reverse the younger the child.
4. Social influence will occur in any group, so that the norms of conduct, beliefs, values of the majority will influence the minority.
5. There are no strong barriers to communication. . . . This assumption implies that there is a fluid social structure in the classroom, that the racial subgroups will not segregate themselves into work and friendship cliques.

6. Salutory effects will also be mediated by teacher's influences, which will tend to normalize achievement in the classroom.
7. Competition is good and will lead to improved performance.
8. If the performance standard for a person is raised, he will improve in order to meet the new standard. In order for this to occur, however, the person must be motivated to reach the new standard and not have to exceed his grasp.
9. Teachers will treat children similarly regardless of ethnic background.
10. Desegregation will increase the minority child's self-esteem.
11. Increased self-esteem will lead to increased achievement.

Gerard and Miller (1975) contend that these assumptions are made implicit or explicit in the three processes outlined within the policy of desegregation. The first process discussed is that the child will raise his level of aspirations by virtue of a presumably more advanced curriculum and the higher standards imposed within the desegregated classroom. The authors note that the second process detailed by the policy involves the lateral transmission of values. This transfer of values is necessary if the child is to have the "correct" cultural disposition to achieve in the system. This latter process is the keystone for the assimilationist foundation of the policy. The third process discussed specifies a positive effect upon the minority group child's self esteem, as a result of the belief that he is being treated in the same way as are the majority children. The success of the assimilation effort will be evidenced in the decreasing achievement differentials between minority and dominant Anglo populations.

The second major goal of desegregation is the reduction of racial prejudice through contacts between students. Allport (1954) concludes that only equal status contact improves intergroup relations by leading to the

perception of common interests and common humanity. The following premises are derived from Allport's work: (1) Desegregation is a prerequisite to contact and acquaintance. (2) Equal status contact among students, staff, and parents of various racial/ethnic groups in desegregated schools will reduce prejudice. (3) Equal status contact in schools is enhanced when (a) equal status contact is sanctioned by explicit school policy, (b) students, staff, and parents of various racial/ethnic groups work together, (c) the school program emphasized the common interests and common humanity of persons of all racial/ethnic groups. Gerard and Miller (1975) list the elimination of prejudice, as outlined in the fifth assumption, as preceding the accomplishment of assimilation. Thus, theoretically, equal status contacts must precede the transmission of majority cultural values.

The Dilemma of School Desegregation

The dilemma of school desegregation lies in the possibility that these two policy goals may not be complimentary. Can both goals be achieved within the same institutional setting? Are equal status contacts possible in an environment which is conducive to assimilation, and can assimilation be accomplished in an environment of equal status contacts? In an earlier paper, Iadicola (1977) attempts to develop a model of the assimilation process in the desegregated school. A prerequisite of the model is the numerically minority position of Mexican-American students in the school. This condition serves to inhibit ingroup segregation and encourage structural assimilation. This also follows from Gerard and Miller's 4th assumption. "Many proponents of desegregation argue that as long as the black students in a given classroom are in a minority, majority white influence over the minority will prevail, thus changing the achievement-related conduct, the beliefs, and the values of the black children in the class" (Gerard and Miller, 1975:17). However, being of a numerical minority may have a negative effect upon status relations

between students, serving to reinforce a condition of status deprivation in interaction with those in the majority. Blau (1977) in his latest work discusses these same structural factors as determinants of status or power, and assimilation.

The interaction of students in the informal social system of the secondary school has been recognized for some time as reflecting the rank order statuses and relationships of the larger society (Hollingshead, 1949; Gordon, 1957). Such replication implies the presence of these same structural inducements. The generally heterogeneous population of secondary schools reflect the demographics of the larger community. On the other hand, neighborhood elementary schools are relatively homogeneous in racial and social class composition because of residential segregation. In these latter schools status relations within the informal social system as defined racially, do not generally reflect those of the larger society. Since desegregation increases the heterogeneity of the populations of elementary schools, like the secondary schools, is it likely that the status structure within the desegregated school will tend to replicate the status differences of the larger society? The specific question is what is the relationship between percent Anglo and the socioeconomic status of the school with status relations between Anglo and minority students.

Desegregation Research: Two Paths

Desegregation and Assimilation:

There appear to be two directions that desegregation research has taken which corresponds to the two policy goals. The assimilation goal is reinterpreted in terms of desegregation's effect upon achievement. Assimilation is the intermediary step between the implementation and the outcomes which is often assumed to be operating as a result of the mixing of students. Gerard and Miller (1975) specifically test this assumption, without providing any

additional support for the hypothesis. There have been two major reviews of the desegregation-achievement literature. Weinbert (1977:22) notes "that of the studies cited . . . 29 found definite achievement effects by minority students in a desegregated setting; 19 reported no effect." St. John (1975) concludes in her review that biracial schooling is neither a success nor a failure. The National Opinion Research Center (1973) analysis of 200 southern biracial high schools generally found weak effects of school racial composition. Bradley and Bradley (1977) contend that studies which show beneficial effects of desegregation suffer severe methodological deficiencies, while those studies relatively well designed provide both support and non-support for the integration thesis.

Other research dealing specifically with the effects of the social class level of the school also have mixed results. The relationship between the overall social class of the school and its effects upon college aspirations and attendance has been extensively explored (Sewell, Haller, and Ohlendorf, 1970; Haller and Butterworth, 1960; Alexander and Campbell, 1964; and Duncan, Haller, and Portes, 1968). A number of researchers have hypothesized and found that a working class student attending a school where most are middle class will be more likely to go to college (Wilson, 1959; Turner, 1964; Michael, 1961; and Boyle, 1966). These results have been disputed by the research of Hauser (1970) and Sewell and Armer (1966) which concluded that the contextual effect of school social class on college aspirations was small. An explanation, which has become known as the frog pond effect (Davis, 1966; Meyer, 1970; Nelson, 1972; and Alexander and Eckland, 1975), contends that discouragement on the part of the working class students occurs when they compare their success in school to that of the middle class student. This comparison effect may also manifest itself in the status relations between the students in the school. Schools in which a frog

pond effect is taking place may also be characterized by unequal status relations. Assimilation may be taking place in these schools in terms of achievement; however, the unequal status relations may be serving to depress the student's aspiration, or in some cases, status inequality may be altogether inhibiting achievement by means of obstructing assimilation. Iadicola (1977) found that in conditions of Anglo population dominance, those students who had integrated into the Anglo peer group (achieved structural assimilation) and achieved academically in school (cultural assimilation) were more ethnically outgroup oriented than those who did not. A clear understanding of the dynamics of the relationship between the two goals, assimilation and status relations, may provide some additional insight to account for the mixed nature of the research on the effects of desegregation.

Desegregation and Status Relations:

Research in the area of status relations has taken another path toward the investigation of the second policy goal. Empirical and theoretical work in the area of status relations indicates that achieving equal status contacts among persons of different racial/ethnic groups is complicated by factors not foreseen in Allport's earlier model. Katz found that in biracial work groups matched on measured intelligence, blacks displayed marked social inhibition and subordination to white partners, making fewer proposals, accepting contributions of whites uncritically, and talking more to whites than to other blacks (Katz, et. al., 1958; Katz and Benjamin, 1960). Similar findings were reported in over a dozen other investigations between 1950 and 1960 (Berger, et. al., 1972). Cohen (et. al., 1970) report that black and white public school children display similar responses in expectations of competence when involved in a biracial group game. White students had higher initiation rates and were more influential than blacks.

The literature on status organizing processes in small groups has been generalized and developed into a single theoretical framework by Berger, Cohen, and Zelditch (1972). A central concept in the theory is that "diffuse status characteristics" such as race, age, and sex, are: (1) differentially valued, (2) associated with a perceived set of specific abilities (i.e., blacks are athletic, women are emotional), and (3) each status defines some general expectations for relative competence. Under conditions where a task is valued and group members are motivated both to succeed and to take others' behaviors into account, and where individuals are perceived as having status characteristics and their attributes, competence is expected. Moreover, general expectations for superior competence will be held by both low- and high-status subjects if no other social basis for discrimination exists.

In situations where race/ethnicity exist as diffuse status characteristics, the general expectation is that Anglos expect minority individuals to participate at lower levels of competence, and minority individuals fulfill that expectation of inferiority by lower levels of participation, deference to Anglo suggestions, etc. This cycle of rank order status differentiation forms the basis for unequal status relationships and results in what Cohen (1972) has termed "interracial interaction disability." This "interracial interaction disability" on the part of minority students serve to reinforce the negative stereotypes the dominant Anglo student population has of them, thus preserving the status structure of the dominant society in terms of ethnicity.

The two streams of research, which stem from the goals of the policy, may inadvertently point to the dilemma in the policy of school desegregation mentioned earlier. What is the effect of a policy of mixing students of different racial and social classes to achieve resocialization, upon status relations in desegregated schools. The gap in the status relations

literature, the effect of peer group contextual factors, is the primary focus of the assimilation-achievement research. Closing this gap may provide insight into the mixed findings discussed earlier, and the policy problems in achieving the goals of desegregation.

Hypothesis

The dilemma of desegregation manifests itself in the adverse effects of a high percentage of Anglo student enrollment and a high level of socioeconomic status upon status relations between Anglo and minority students in desegregated schools. Mixing students in a manner which increases the likelihood of resocialization, assimilation, may serve to recreate the unequal status relations of the larger society. Creating an environment which is conducive to equal status relations, on the other hand, may negate the positive influence which higher status Anglo students have on minority student performance. When desegregated schools have a high percentage of Anglo students and a high level of socioeconomic status, this enhances the status differences between Anglo and minority students. In this environment, the minority student is in a dependent position in the school in terms of achieving status in the Anglo dominant peer group. The assimilation process serves to downgrade the ethnicity of the minority student and to reward conformance to Anglo, middle class behaviors and attitudes.

If there is present an incongruence in the two policy goals, one would hypothesize that (1) there is a positive relationship between percent Anglo enrollment in the school and level of status inequality between Anglo and black, and Anglo and Hispanic students, and (2) there is a positive relationship between total socioeconomic status of the school and the level of status inequality between Anglo and black, and Anglo and Hispanic students.

Sample

Data is derived from a study of 13 desegregated schools in California. These 13 schools were selected for which school P.R.I.M.E. evaluation profiles were available on the following student outcomes: academic achievement, self-concept, anxiety, educational and occupational expectations, attitudes toward school, stereotyping of other ethnic groups, positive identity with own ethnic group, and cross-ethnic and intraethnic sociometric choices. Standardized residual scores for each ethnic group in each of the 182 schools were calculated over these outputs, controlling for grade level, parent SES, ethnic percentages in the school, and parent attitudes toward desegregation. Rank orders by school and ethnic group were generated, and the selection of 20 sample schools was made, composed of the 5 schools with the highest black scores, 5 schools with the highest Hispanic scores, 5 schools with the lowest black scores, and 5 schools with the lowest Hispanic scores. The sample dropped to 13 schools when 4 schools declined to participate because of other evaluation studies and 3 schools in one district rescinded the original agreement because of a threatened teacher strike. Of the 13 schools which eventually made up the study sample, 7 are positive-outcome schools, 6 are negative-outcome schools.

Within each of the 13 schools, 3 subsamples were selected. The classroom subsample was a random selection within each school--2 each from grades 2, 4, and 6 or from grades 4, 5, and 6 in schools encompassing only those grades. One school with only 4 classrooms had each classroom in the subsample, bringing the total to 76 classrooms for all 13 schools.

The Pegasus interaction game subsample was randomly selected from the sixth-grade enrollment: 12 students of each ethnic group, 6 males and 6 females, a total of 360. Each game session was to involve 6 students, 3 minority students of the same ethnic group and 3 Anglo students, with all 6

students of the same sex. The maximum sample size possible was 408 students, with "dummy Anglos" added to the Pegasus subsample to balance the groups ethnically. Because of the difficulties encountered in getting all sample students together at specific game times, 336 students (302 from the subsample) participated in 59 sessions. Nine of the sessions were conducted with only 4 students, 2 of each ethnic group. Fifty sessions were conducted with all 6 students.

One parent of each of the Pegasus subsample students composed the parent subsample. Of the 349 parents in the sample, 306 were interviewed, a refusal rate of 12 percent. All of the teachers in each of the 13 schools were asked to complete two questionnaires. Of the 188 teachers in the 13 schools, 177 returned complete questionnaires, 94% response rate.

Operationalizations: Percent Anglo and Socioeconomic Status of the School

The percent Anglo in the school was obtained from the school records. The range of scores for the thirteen schools was 21% to 86% Anglo. The mean of the thirteen schools is 53.62%, standard deviation is 23.02. The school level measure of socioeconomic status was derived from two sources of data; (1) sixth grade teachers' rating of occupation of the fathers of each of the students attending their classes and (2) the percent of students of each ethnic group enrolled in the sixth grade. These SES ratings were based on a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 for unemployed or on welfare, 1 for unskilled laborers, 2 for skilled laborers or tradesmen, 3 for clerical workers, 4 for managerial positions, and 5 for professional positions. SES scores for parents of individual students from each ethnic group attending the sixth grade were summed, averaged, and then standardized against a sample of 10,000 students from 174 desegregated schools involved in an earlier study. A single school-level score was computed from the standardized SES scores assigned to each ethnic group, as follows: Anglo SES score X (percent Anglo

students enrolled : 100, etc.), and then summed across all groups. The scoring range is 27 to 59. A higher score represents a higher socioeconomic status of parents of students in the school. Table 1 presents the school scores for percent Anglo and socioeconomic status.

Table 1 about here

Status Relations: Procedures for Data Collection

A survey instrument was developed to measure status relations between Anglo and black/Hispanic sixth grade students. It was necessary for the instrument to meet the two scope conditions specified in the literature: task orientation and collective orientation (Webster and Driskel, 1978). Task orientation refers to the specification that the group members' purpose in meeting is to solve some problems rather than simply to enjoy each other's company. The interaction game developed incorporated a problem of group survival to be solved to meet this specification. Collective orientation means that the members consider it legitimate and necessary to consider every individual's ideas in working on the task. Instructions in the game specified that the decision would be a group decision and that the ranking of the survival supplies was to be discussed among the members. Students were told that at the conclusion of the game their group answers would be compared to the ranking of supplies completed by the N.A.S.A. astronauts, to see how well they had done.

The game, Space Station Pegasus, incorporates an initial sociometric status ranking dimension in the beginning of the game and an individual and group decision task derived from a classroom instructional tool (Baldrige, 1975) in the second portion of the game (SEMS Technical Manual, 1978). The game is divided into two parts in terms of the two tasks to be completed.

Each Pegasus session involved six sixth grade children, all females or all males, three of whom were Anglo and three of whom were black or Hispanic. The students were randomly selected from the total sixth-grade population of each school in the study. (In schools with an insufficient sixth-grade population for sampling, the fifth grade was also sampled. However, sixth and fifth-grade students were not mixed in the Pegasus session.) In schools with an enrollment of two ethnic groups, Anglo/black or Anglo/Hispanic, there were four sessions with a total of twenty-four students participating. In schools with an Anglo/black/Hispanic enrollment, there were eight sessions involving forty-eight students. From the thirteen schools selected, a total of fifty-nine sessions were conducted (35 Hispanic/Anglo groups and 24 black/Anglo groups of students.).

Equipment for the game involved: a circular Pegasus game table 48 inches in diameter, six chairs positioned in a semicircle around the table, 3" x 4" supply cards, Pegasus crew position ballots and supply ranking scoring sheets, videotape recorder, camera and tripod, and name tags. The game was administered by two experimenters, both Anglo males. It was important that Anglo experimenters were consistently used in order to closely approximate the Anglo-dominant authority pattern in the classroom. Work was divided between the two experimenters, such that one consistently read the narration, while the other operated the videotape equipment. Because the locations which were provided varied from school to school, the luxury of a hidden, unobtrusive camera was not possible. The camera was positioned approximately 15 feet directly in front of the edge of the table. A microphone was placed on a chair under the front part of the table. The camera remained stationary, focused on the six students facing the camera. The videotape equipment was in operation only in the second half of the game,

during the group decision. This procedure was followed consistently throughout all fifty-nine sessions.

Students entered the room together and were allowed to sit where they wished, given the constraint of the semicircular positioning of seats. Although it was recognized that randomization of seating would have reduced any bias in the interaction derived from seat location, it was decided that the seat choice itself was a part of the status relations that should not be excluded from the assessment of status relations. As a general rule, given the hybrid nature of the instrument, manipulation and experimental controls were minimized.

Status Relations; Scoring Procedures; Crew Sociometrics

Students were asked to individually decide upon crew positions. Each of the crew positions were described in terms of their role and status rank; commander, second in command, medical officer, communications officer, cook, and deck hand. Students made their selections by secret ballot. Students were asked to draw lines on a sheet of paper connecting each student's name to one crew position. Students wore name tags during the game for easy identification. After students had marked their ballots, they were collected. To minimize the effect that the crew voting may have on the second part of the game, students were asked not to discuss their decisions.

Each of the crew positions were weighted in accordance with their status rank. Several scores were calculated from the crew ranking sociometric. One such measure was an overall assessment of crew status based on the average score an individual received from members of the group. Other scores calculated were, a self selection score, average score minority/Anglo students received, and average score individual respondent gave to own ethnic group and the other ethnic group. Each of these measures express an aspect of the

status position of the individual and his or her ethnic group in the informal social system.

Influence Score

In the second half of the game students were asked to rank order a list of supplies in terms of their importance for moon survival. Students first individually ranked the supplies. Following the individual rankings, the group discussed the items and came to a group decision. The group interaction during the group decision was videotaped for later coding. During the group decision, the students own individual rankings were kept before them for their own reference. An absolute difference score was calculated, comparing the individual's ranking of supplies with the groups final decision on the ranking. This provided an indicator of the individuals influence on the group decision, another dimension of individual status.

Scoring Procedures; Videotaped Interaction

Additional measures were obtained from the videotaping of the interaction. Interaction was scored along seven general behavioral dimensions; individual leadership behavior, individual task orientation, individual's behavior toward own ethnic group, individual's behavior toward other ethnic group, own ethnic group behavior toward the individual, other ethnic group behavior toward the individual, and rating of the group decision. A listing of bipolar adjectives constructed along a seven-point semantic differential composed each dimension. These semantic differentials were pretested with twenty-five randomly selected cases from the sample. The adjective pairs were evaluated in terms of the observer's ability to clearly identify the subject's overt behavior in the game. Two observers scored the same cases in terms of sixty-seven bipolar adjectives. Ratings were compared and discussed. The adjectives were then factor analyzed in terms of the seven

predefined dimensions. Table 2 presents the final factor analysis of those items selected.

Table 2 about here

Six raters, one male and one female of each of the three ethnic groups tested (Anglo, black, and Hispanic), underwent a two-week training (approximately twenty hours.) The training entailed (1) reviewing and discussing the verbal definitions of the adjectives, (2) viewing and discussing a one-and-a-half-hour training videotape which served to behaviorally define the adjectives and to present the extreme scores, 1 and 7, on each adjective rating, and (3) rating by observers of a selection of subjects; ratings were then discussed. Observers were released when they had attained a predetermined satisfactory percentage of agreement. Each observer was randomly assigned to a child in the game. Observers viewed the tape a minimum of two complete times for the rating of each of the seven dimensions. At the conclusion of the observations, the raters reviewed their scores by marking the numerical codes for each of the ratings alongside each of the adjectives. Observers were instructed not to consult with each other during the ratings. Raters were allowed to rate for a maximum of two hours at any one sitting. This limitation served to reduce the fatigue factor in the ratings. A seventh observer (Anglo female), who trained with the group of six, together with the two trainers, also randomly selected cases which were being rated by the six observers in order to evaluate their ratings in terms of agreement. Internal consistency reliability coefficients were calculated for each one-third of the sample of cases completed in order to check the performance of the six observers over the full length of the ratings. Table 2 presents the reliabilities (Cronbach's Alpha, Nunally, 1960) for each of the

dimensions of each third of the sample, as well as the composite reliabilities. Meetings of observers and supervisors were held periodically, more frequently during the first month, to discuss problem cases or general problems with definitions and procedures.

Scoring Procedures; Timing Measures

At the conclusion of the coding of the verbal interaction, timing measures were carried out. Each subject was timed for the length of time he or she spoke and the length of time he or she manipulated and held the supply cards during the group decision. Each subject was independently timed three times by three different observers. An average score was calculated for time speaking and time manipulating and holding cards. Each score was standardized in terms of the total length of time for the group interaction. All the measures individually assessed the subjects performing in the game in terms of their status. It was important at this point to calculate the level of differences in status between individuals in the group.

Status Difference Factors

Two status difference scores were calculated from a factor analysis of a subset of the measures obtained in the Pegasus game session: (1) individual's status difference score and (2) individual's ethnic group's status difference score. An individual's status difference score was calculated from six status measures by subtracting the individual's score on a given measure from the average score for the Anglo students in the game on the measure. These six status difference measures together with a seventh measure, a rating of the nature of the group decision in terms of equal status versus unequal status relations, were then factor analyzed. The same procedure was followed for the group status difference score. The average Hispanic/black status scores were subtracted from the average scores of the Anglo students in the game on the same status measure. Factor score

coefficients were calculated for each of the items to compose the final measures. Table 3 presents the factor score loadings for each of the status difference items composing the two final factors. A high score on each of the factors indicates unequal status in terms of Anglo dominance; a zero or negative score indicates an absence of Anglo student status dominance, this is defined in terms of the theoretical conceptualization as equal status relations, diffuse status characteristics are irrelevant to the interaction.

 Table 3 about here

Findings

Linear correlations were calculated for the peer group contextual variables (Percent Anglo and Socioeconomic Status of the School) and status differences for black and Hispanic students. The school level scores, percent Anglo and Socioeconomic status of the school were assigned to each of the students in the school. The analysis was then performed at the individual level. Both the individual's sex and socioeconomic status were added to the analysis as control variables. Sex was coded, 1 (male) and 2 (female). Occupation of the head of the household was asked directly of the student's parents and was later coded in terms of the Duncan SES scores. Table 4 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficients between the independent and dependent variables.

In viewing the findings, there appears to be a difference in the relationship between percent Anglo and status differences for Hispanic and black students. Only in the case of black students is percent Anglo correlated with status differences, .19 ($p < .10$) and .49 ($p < .001$). On the other

Table 4 about here

hand, the socioeconomic status of the school is more consistently related to status differences between Anglo and Hispanic students than it is in the case of Anglo and black students. For Hispanic students, socioeconomic status is correlated .29 ($p < .01$) with individual status differences and .36 ($p < .01$) with group status differences. Socioeconomic status of the school is correlated only with group status differences, .35 ($p < .01$) for black and Anglo status relations.

It may be that Hispanic ethnicity is not a diffuse status characteristic on which students are ranked. If so, the higher percentages of Anglo students in the school would not have an effect upon status relations for Hispanic students. Thus, ranking may only be occurring in terms of social class, not ethnicity, for Hispanic/Anglo status relations. On the other hand, for black students ethnicity and social class are both potent diffuse status characteristics by which they are compared and ranked. However, given the high correlation between percent Anglo and socioeconomic status of the school .82 ($p < .001$), it is likely that the percent Anglo of the school is the true correlate of status differences for black students, and the socioeconomic status of the school is a spurious factor. Thus, race or ethnicity is the dominant ranking factor in relations between Anglo and black students. Little research has been done applying expectations status theory specifically to Hispanic and Anglo student interaction. Further research with this population may provide additional support for these findings.

Regarding the individual background variables, only sex is found to be a significant correlate of status differences. The black female has a lower level of status inequality in her relations with Anglo students, than black

male students, $-.26$ ($p \leq .05$) with group status differences. The opposite is the case for the Hispanic students, $.29$ ($p \leq .01$) and $.26$ ($p \leq .01$) with group and individual status differences, respectively. Female Hispanic students are found to have higher levels of status inequality in their interactions with Anglo students than Hispanic male students.

The relationship between total socioeconomic status and percent Anglo of the school with status differences was analyzed separately by sex.

Table 5 about here

For blacks, the relationship between total SES and percent Anglo of the school with status differences is statistically significant only for the male student, and of the two independent variables, again, it appears that percent Anglo of the school is the factor accounting for the level of status inequality in the school, $.87$ ($p \leq .001$) and $.59$ ($p \leq .001$) for group and individual status differences. The black females' level of status inequality is not affected by the hypothesized characteristics of the student population.

In the case of Hispanic students, only females are affected by the total socioeconomic status of the school, $-.55$ ($p \leq .001$), with group status differences and $.43$ ($p \leq .001$) with individual status differences. This relationship is not significant for the Hispanic male. It is unclear at this point what characteristics the black male and Hispanic female populations have in common to account for the effects of peer contextual factors upon status differences. Or better put, it is unclear as to why the relationship is not present for the black female and Hispanic male student populations. Given that the sample is only composed of thirteen schools, it can always be said that the absence of the relationships in these latter two populations is an artifact of the specific schools in the sample. However, further research

is needed to investigate this relationship on a larger sample.

In general, the findings indicate that when increasing the percentage of Anglo students in school and the level of socioeconomic status of the school to achieve a positive socializing influence upon minority students, one is also increasing the status differential between Anglo and minority students. Specifically, however, the results give only further credence to the hypothesis for the black male and Hispanic female subpopulations.

Discussion

Nevertheless, the dilemma for policy makers concerned with desegregation is apparent. By placing minority students in an environment which is conducive to their assimilation, that is, one dominated by Anglo and high socioeconomic status students, a process develops by which there is a replication and reinforcement of the status inequalities found in the dominant society. Lockheed (1976) concluded in a study testing the effects of the diffuse status characteristics of sex upon leadership patterns in mixed sex groups, that classroom tasks should be first initially performed in sex segregated groups. Allowing female students to gain experience in the task in a sex segregated environment improves the status relations in later mixed sex groups. The implications of these findings are central to the dilemma discussed. Is sex segregation in education beneficial to later status relations between males and females? By extension, the question arises, is race/ethnic segregation in education beneficial to the later status relations between Anglo and minority students?

Conclusions such as these lead to three major questions in terms of social policy. The first and foremost question is whether assimilation, or resocialization, is the most beneficial policy for black and Hispanic minorities? The ethnocentric foundation of the policy of desegregation which is evident in the early theories of cultural deprivation, should be

reevaluated in light of today's power relationships (Iadicola, 1978). Nevertheless, if the answer is "yes" to this first question, then, is status inequality necessary for the resocialization/assimilation of minority students into the Anglo dominant mainstream? It may be that placing a minority student in a position of inferior status makes him or her more dependent upon Anglo students for rewards and acceptance, therefore encouraging conformance to Anglo norms and values. However, if this condition is not necessary, which school processes contribute or counteract the status inequality experienced in Anglo dominant school environments?

Much research has been done on the effects of training sessions as reinforcers of performance characteristics to overcome the effects of diffuse status characteristics (Cohen, et. al., 1970). However, considering the scale of such endeavors and the expense, the practicality of such interventions on a large scale in schools is questionable. In a recent paper, Cohen and Deslonde (1979), discuss possible structural factors such as minority staffing patterns, as well as teaching methods in the classroom, grouping practices, and level of conflict in the school as possible factors affecting status relations and academic outcomes. Mercer, Iadicola, and Moore (1979) present a hypothesized model of status equalization and ranking processes in desegregated schools. In this model, ten processes which operate in the school are hypothesized to effect status relations between Anglo and minority students; (1) norm referenced testing practices, (2) classroom grouping practices, (3) minority staff influence, (4) minority parent influence, (5) multicultural curriculum, (6) Anglo dominant normative environment, (7) individual competitive environment, (8) busing practices, (9) resource allocation, and (10) Anglo dominance of extracurricular activities. By manipulating these school processes, it may be possible to accomplish both goals of desegregation. In subsequent papers, we will be testing this model,

in terms of the relationship between these hypothesized school processes and status, relations between Anglo and black, and Anglo and Hispanic elementary school students.

References

Alexander, Karl and Bruce K. Eckland.

- 1975 "Contextual effects in the high school attainment process."
American Sociological Review (August):586-595.

Alexander, C. Norman, Jr. and Ernest Q. Campbell

- 1964 "Peer influences on adolescent educational aspirations and
attainments." American Sociological Review (August):586-595.

Allport, Gordon

- 1954 The nature of prejudice. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Wesley
Publishing Company.

Alsop, Stewart

- 1968 "The anti-honky war." Newsweek (December 16):116.

Baldrige, J. Victor.

- 1975 Sociology: A critical approach to power, conflict, and change.
New York: Wiley.

Berger, J. P., B. P. Cohen and M. Zelditch, Jr.

- 1972 "Status characteristics and social interaction." American
Sociological Review 37:241-55.

Blau, Peter M.

- 1977 Inequality and heterogeneity; a primitive theory of social structure.
New York: The Free Press.

Boyle, Richard P.

- 1966 "On neighborhood context and college plans." American Sociological
Review (October):706-707.

Bradley, Lawrence A. and Giffert W. Bradley.

- 1977 "The academic achievement of black students in desegregated schools:
a critical review." Review of Educational Research:399-449.

Carlson, Robert A.

- 1975 The quest for conformity: Americanization through education. New York: Wiley.

Cohen, E. G., M. E. Lohman, K. Hall, D. Lucerno and S. Roper.

- 1970 "Expectation training I: Altering the effect of a status characteristic." Technical Report #2, School of Education, Stanford University.

Cohen, E. G.

- 1972 "Interracial interaction disability." Human Relations 25:9-24.

Cohen, E. G. and James L. Deslonde.

- 1979 "The desegregated school: problems in status, power, and interracial climate," unpublished paper.

Davis, J. A.

- 1966 "The campus as a frog pond: An application of the theory of relative deprivation to career decisions of college men." American Journal of Sociology (July):17-31.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, Archibald O. Haller and Alejandro Portes.

- 1968 "Peer influences on aspirations: A reinterpretation." American Journal of Sociology (September):119-137.

Gerard, B. Harold and Norman Miller.

- 1975 School desegregation; a long term study. New York: Plenum Press.

Gordon, C. Wayne

- 1957 The social system of the high school. Glencoe: Free Press.

Haller, A. O. and C. E. Butterworth

- 1960 "Peer influences on levels of occupational and educational aspirations." Social Forces (May):289-295.

Hauser, Robert M.

- 1970 "Context and consex: A cautionary tale." *American Journal of Sociology* (January):645-664.

Hollingshead, August B.

- 1947 *Elmstown Youth*. New York: Wiley.

Iadicola, Peter

- 1977 "Desegregation as a model of assimilation." Paper presented at American Sociological Association annual meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

Iadicola, Peter.

- 1978 "Intellectual models and school policy; desegregation as a method of assimilation." Unpublished manuscript.

Iadicola, P., June Lewis, Helen Moore and Herbert Nickles III.

- 1978 SEMS Technical Manual. Riverside: University of California, P.R.I.M.E. Projects.

Iannacone, Lawrence.

- 1977 "Three views of change in educational politics." *The Politics of Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Katz, I. and L. Benjamin

- 1960 "Effects of white authoritarianism in biracial work groups." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 61:448-56.

Katz, I. and L. Benjamin

- 1958 "Effects of white authoritarianism in biracial work groups." *Human Relations* 11:123-41.

Lockheed, Marlaine E.

- 1976 *The modification of female leadership behavior in the presence of males*. Princeton: Educational Testing Service.

Mercer, Jane R., Peter Iadicola, and Helen Moore.

- 1979 "Building effective multi-ethnic schools: evolving models and paradigms." Desegregation: past, present, and future. Walter G. Stephan and Joe R. Faegin, editors. Plenum Publishers.

Meyer, John W.

- 1970 "High school effects on college intentions." American Journal of Sociology (July):59-70.

Michael, John A.

- 1961 "High school climate and plans for entering college." Public Opinion Quarterly (Winter):585-95.

National Opinion Research Center

- 1973 Southern schools: An evaluation of the emergency school assistance program and of school desegregation, Vols. I and II. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.

St. John, Nancy H.

- 1975 School desegregation: Outcomes for children. New York: Wiley.

Nelson, J. I.

- 1972 "High school context and college plans: the impact of social structure on aspiration." American Sociological Review (April): 143-148.

Sewell, William H. and J. M. Armer

- 1966 "Reply to Turner, Michael and Boyer." American Sociological Review (October):707-712.

Sewell, W. H., A. O. Haller and G. W. Ohlendorf.

- 1970 "The educational and early occupational status attainment process: Replication and revision." American Sociological Review (December):1014-1027.

Turner, Ralph H.

1964 The social context of ambition. San Francisco: Chandler.

Webster, Murray Jr. and J. E. Briskell, Jr.

1978 "Status generalization: A review and some new data." American Sociological Review 43 (April):220-236.

Weinberg, Meyer

1977 Minority students; A research appraisal. Washington: National Institute of Education.

Wilson, Allen B.

1959 "Residential segregation of social classes and aspirations of high school boys." American Sociological Review (December):836-845.

Table 1

School Level Mean Scores for
Group Contextual Variables¹

<u>Socioeconomic Status</u>		<u>Percent Anglo Students</u>	
<u>Schools</u>	<u>School $\bar{X}$</u>	<u>Schools</u>	<u>Percent</u>
F	58.44	C	21%
A	57.62	H	30%
B	57.35	I	33%
D	50.10	K	35%
E	45.48	L	37%
M	44.44	G	38%
G	43.66	D	51%
K	41.24	J	65%
I	40.71	E	69%
J	38.03	M	76%
L	32.91	B	77%
H	31.40	A	79%
C	27.30	F	86%
	$\bar{X}$ 43.74		$\bar{X}$ 53.62
	SD 10.10		SD 23.03

¹Nine of the schools were biethnic: Black/Anglo (B, H, L), Hispanic/Anglo (A, D, E, F, J, M). Four of the schools were triethnic: Black/Hispanic/Anglo (C, G, I, K).

Table 2

**Final Factor Loadings and Reliability Coefficients for
Each Third of Sample**

<u>Leadership</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>	<u>Task Orientation</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>	<u>Group Decision</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>			
Dominant/Submissive	.91	Interested/Bored	.81	Democratic/Authoritarian	.77			
Directing/Nondirecting	.84	Industrious/Lackadaisical	.84	Group decision/Individual Decision	.78			
Initiates/Follows	.85	Concentrating/Distracting	.72	Organized/Disorganized	.48			
Opinionated/Uopinionated	.78	Independent/Dependent	.59	Participating/Nonparticipating	.76			
Decisive/Indecisive	.77	Logical/Illogical	.62	Integrative/Separative	.83			
Innovative/Rigid	.54	Orderly/Unorderly	.68	Cooperative/Noncooperative	.75			
Manipulative/Nonmanipulative	.33	Helpful/Not helpful	.44	Equal group participation/ Unequal group participation	.67			
Organizing/Nonorganizing	.80	Participating/Nonparticipating	.83	Group unified/Group split	.75			
Demanding/Complacent	.77	Attentive/Inattentive	.61					
Extroverted/Introverted	.74	Persevering/Quitting	.62					
Effective/Ineffective	.84	Enthusiastic/Indifferent	.79					
<u>Reliabilities (Cronbach's Alpha)</u>		<u>Reliabilities (Cronbach's Alpha)</u>		<u>Reliabilities (Cronbach's Alpha)</u>				
1	2	3	All	1	2	3	All	Entire Sample
.94	.93	.92	.93	.91	.90	.91	.91	.89

<u>Individual Behavior Toward Own and Other Ethnic Group</u>	<u>Toward Own Group Factor Loading</u>	<u>Toward Other Group Factor Loading</u>	<u>Own and Other Ethnic Group Behavior Toward Individual</u>	<u>Own Group Factor Loading</u>	<u>Other Group Factor Loading</u>						
Friendly/Aloof	.84	.84	Friendly/Aloof	.79	.82						
Warm/Cold	.88	.80	Warm/Cold	.82	.83						
Agreeable/Disagreeable	.57	.56	Agreeable/Disagreeable	.74	.69						
Sociable/Self-contained	.63	.59	Smiles/Frowns	.66	.72						
Smiles/Frowns	.65	.64	Popular/Unpopular	.66	.66						
Supports/Does not support	.64	.66	Supports/Does not support	.71	.89						
Cheerful/Morose	.77	.68	Accepts suggestions/Rejects suggestions	.70	.65						
Accepts suggestions/Rejects suggestions	.61	.53									
<u>Reliabilities (Cronbach's Alpha)</u>			<u>Reliabilities (Cronbach's Alpha)</u>								
1	2	3	All	1	2	3	All				
.86	.89	.88	.88	.85	.90	.90	.88	.87	.88	.89	.86

Table 3
Factor Loadings for
Status Differences, Individual and Group

Individual's Ethnic Group Status Differences		Individual Status Differences	
Variable	Factor Loading	Variable	Factor Loading
<u>Leadership</u>	.67	<u>Leadership</u>	.69
Anglo group score minus Hispanic/Black score		Anglo group score minus individual score	
<u>Speaking</u>	.59	<u>Speaking</u>	.69
Anglo group score minus Hispanic/Black score		Anglo group score minus individual score	
<u>Card Manipulation</u>	.62	<u>Card Manipulation</u>	.58
Anglo group score minus Hispanic/Black score		Anglo group score minus individual score	
<u>Average Crew Status Ranking</u>	.63	<u>Crew Status Ranking</u>	.48
Anglo group score minus Hispanic/Black score		Anglo group score minus individual score	
<u>Influence</u>	-.28	<u>Influence</u>	-.26
Anglo group score minus Hispanic/Black score		Anglo group score minus individual score	
<u>Individual Crew Selection</u>	.42	<u>Crew Self-Selection Score</u>	.30
Anglo group self-selection score minus Hispanic/Black self-selection score		Anglo group self-selection score minus individual self-selection score	
<u>Group Decision</u>	-.21	<u>Group Decision</u>	-.14

Table 4
Correlations between Peer Group Contextual Variables
and Status Relations

<u>Contextual Variables</u>	Black		Hispanic	
	<u>Individual status Differences</u>	<u>Group status Differences</u>	<u>Individual status Differences</u>	<u>Group status Differences</u>
School socioeconomic status	.08	.35**	.29**	.36**
School percent Anglo	.19	.49***	.03	.06
<u>Individual Variables</u>				
Individual Socioeconomic status	.09	.09	-.02	-.01
Sex	-.07	-.26*	.26**	.29**
$\bar{X}$	-.11	-.26	.07	.06
SD	.69	.80	.95	.99
N	63	63	100	100
* Significant at the .05 level ** Significant at the .01 level *** Significant at the .001 level				

Table 5

Correlations between Peer Group Contextual Variables
and Status Relations by Sex

Black Sample

<u>Contextual Variables</u>	Male (n=32)		Female (n=31)	
	<u>Individual status Differences</u>	<u>Group Status Differences</u>	<u>Individual status Differences</u>	<u>Group status Differences</u>
School Socioeconomic Status	.29*	.57***	-.10	.15
School Percent Anglo	.59***	.87***	-.14	.16
$\bar{X}$	-.05	-.08	-.16	-.44
SD	.81	.81	.80	.48

Hispanic Sample

<u>Contextual Variables</u>	Male (n=53)		Female (n=47)	
	<u>Individual status Differences</u>	<u>Group Status Differences</u>	<u>Individual status Differences</u>	<u>Group status Differences</u>
School Socioeconomic Status	.11	.10	.43***	.55***
School Percent Anglo	-.03	-.12	.02	.12
$\bar{X}$	-.21	-.15	.37	.33
SD	.64	.71	1.22	1.12

-
- * Significant at the .05 level
 ** Significant at the .01 level
 *** Significant at the .001 level